A. Interpretation: the affirmative arguments must be specific to violent felons.

B. Violation: the aff is extra topical since it prescribes action for all juveniles, not specifically violent felons.

C. Standards:

1. Text: deviates from text of the resolution which is violent felons specifically. If the resolution was concerned with how all felons should be treated, the framers wouldn't have included the modifier felons. This means that in order for the ac to affirm, the resolution would have been written like, juveniles charged with any felony. this means that he has to take words away from the resolution, violating textuality. Further, proving all felons should be treated in a certain way doesn't prove the text of the resolution, as that doesn't account for outliers, like violent felons. For example, i can say that cats are ugly in general, while there can still be one cat that is an outlier which isn't subsumed. Hence, his categorization of all juveniles doesn't take into account the particular outlier affect of violent felons, meaning subsuming isn't sufficient to meet the text of this resolution.

2. Quality of ground: not specifying violent felons and being extra topical massively increases the quality of ground for the aff since they can prep and get literature about the greatest effects of treating random felons who are juveniles. This means that the aff's extratopicality allows them to garner greater quality of ground than the resolution is mandating. Moreover, this is uniquely bad since i will never be prepped on that ground. Given that the resolution only specified violent felony, i will never have the pre-round prep to answer back the other scenario's of felonies that their interp justifies. Pre-round prep is essential so that i can have the resources necessary to win the round. Ground is key to fairness since it is the basis for argumentation.

D. Fairness is a voter because debate is a competitive activity designed to determine the better debater; adjudicating unfair debates only determines who was arbitrarily advantaged, not who gave the better performance. Theory is an issue of competing interpretations since reasonability invites judge intervention as i